

## I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to address the various basic factors and key questions which would influence a new building program and to present a preliminary overview of potential options for proposed construction in the Langley Compound. The obvious first question is "Will there be a new building?" Assuming the answer to be yes, other questions arise. What will be the scope and scale of this new facility? Will the new facility solve for Headquarters Building needs, external building needs, or both? How will the building program be funded and what time frame is acceptable? The intent of this effort is to evaluate these factors and considerations as a preliminary assessment which will provide a basis for further study, development, and future decision-making relative to such a potential program.

## II. BRIEF HISTORY

Throughout the years, the Agency has strived to consolidate its Headquarters functions and holdings at one central location. Due to the approval of less than required appropriations from the Congress, only a portion of the Agency was provided for in the new Headquarters Building at Langley in early 1960. The remainder of Agency external functions were eventually relocated from temporary buildings to permanent building satellite complexes in Washington, D.C., and Northern Virginia. Several years after

the occupancy of Headquarters Building, the Printing Services Building was constructed on the Headquarters site. In 1974, the new Headquarters Motor Pool Garage was completed and occupied.

25X1 [redacted] will be constructed on the site within the next year. In 197\_ approximately \_\_\_\_\_ acres of Department of Transportation land to the west of our Headquarters compound was assigned to the Agency as part of an underutilized federal property excessing process.

A. Current Agency MWA Facilities Posture

1. Number and Size of MWA Buildings

In addition to the facilities on the Headquarters compound, the Agency occupied<sup>s</sup> \_\_\_\_\_ external buildings and \_\_\_\_\_ square feet of space in the Washington, D.C., Northern Virginia, Metropolitan Washington Area. These facilities are located in satellite complexes such as: 2430 E Street [redacted] which are federally 25X1 owned buildings; and Rosslyn, [redacted] 25X1 which are commercially leased buildings. A specific 25X1 listing of Agency occupied space in the MWA is contained



EFFORTS BY THE GENERAL SERVICES  
ADMINISTRATION TO ACQUIRE A REPLACE-  
MENT FOR THE MAGAZINE BLDG. WHOSE  
LEASE EXPIRES IN NOVEMBER 1975  
HAVE BEEN SUCCESSFUL. A 10 YEAR  
LEASE WAS SIGNED FOR 100,000 SQ. FT.

25X1A

25X1A

## 2. Lease and Ownership Status

Forthcoming and on-going negotiations of leases on all <sup>m</sup>comercially leased buildings will occur within the next year. Lease arrangements are intended to provide the flexibility necessary to be compatible with a seven-to-ten-year time frame anticipated for implementation of an Agency building program at Headquarters. Lease expiration dates and present lease conditions for each leased building is contained in Attachment 2.

CHECK  
✓ THIS

Continuing efforts have been exerted with the General Services Administration to aquire a replacement building on an accelerated basis for Magazine Building whose lease expires in November 1975. GSA has received offerings of space from prospective building owners in response to a formal GSA request of interest and has issued solicitations for specific bid proposals which are due in mid-March for [ ] square feet of space within a five mile radius of Headquarters Building.

CHANGE

External federally owned buildings occupied by the Agency appear to pose no major tenure problems. On-going construction in newly acquired space on the [ ] should provide NPIC with sufficient expansion space. There are no known future

25X1A

25X9

plans for other than continued federal occupancy of [REDACTED] which houses the [REDACTED] Continued Agency occupancy of the 2430 E Street Complex appears certain and unlimited. A major factor requiring its tenure is the existence of satellite telephone equipment systems in Central Building through which all telephone switching for "downtown Agency components" is accomplished. The only potential threat to continued occupancy could be the contiguous location of this complex to State Department Headquarters. It is understood that the State Department has expressed interest in these facilities in the past.

25X1

#### B. Previous Planning

##### 1. Ad Hoc Study Group

In 1966 an ad hoc study group analyzed Agency space posture and recommended the need for further and serious consideration for the design and construction of a "Special Purpose Technical Building" in which all existing and proposed technical functions could be consolidated at the Headquarters site.

##### 2. Building Planning Staff No. 2

A Building Planning Staff was established in 1969. Its major contribution consisted of an interim partial consolidation plan involving expansion of the Printing Services Building and the implementation of a Preliminary Master Plan conceptualizing the consolidation of MWA

Agency functions other than the National Photographic Interpretation Center (NPIC) [ ] on 25X1  
an expanded Headquarters site. The consolidation was  
justified on the basis of cost effectiveness and opera- 25X1  
tional efficiency. The exclusions of NPIC [ ]  
[ ] were due to excess size, functional incompatibility,  
acceptability of operational separation, and unnecessary  
excessive costs of reproducing perfectly adequate  
sophisticated facilities.

3. Headquarters Garage and Preliminary Master Plan  
Upon the development of design drawings for the Headquarters Garage, federal law required the review of the garage design and the Preliminary Master Plan of the Headquarters site by the National Capital Planning Commission (NCPC) and a review of environmental impact descriptions for these presentations by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) prior to project approval. A series of discussions were held with NCPC and EPA and certain parameters were established for physical and environmental factors that would have to be considered.

4. Building Planning Staff No. 3

Re-establishment of the current Building Planning Staff resulted from the impact of an in-house Environmentally Sensitive Equipment (ESE) study which concluded that our Headquarters Building sensitive equipment functions were marginally supported in terms of reliability and safety and that trends indicated existing ESE areas could not provide an adequate environment for future equipment. Study recommendations included a proposal to renovate an area of Headquarters Building to provide adequate ESE facilities while maintaining on-going ESE operations. Affected Agency component reaction to the study favored the construction of a new ESE building rather than modification of the Headquarters Building.

Accelerated action to recruit five contract professional architects and engineers for the Building Planning Staff is underway and many of the candidates are presently undergoing concurrent background investigations and internal processing. Upon successful recruitment and staffing, the BPS will conduct the necessary surveys, research, analysis, and planning to determine Agency facilities requirements for a new building. This

effort will result in a program requirements document for internal approval which will also consist of various planning options, budgetary estimates, timing, organizational posture, and design and construction process recommendations. Upon achieving internal program approvals, a Congressional strategy and program justification will be prepared for Congressional project approval, design funding appropriations, and construction funding appropriations. The BPS will then perform as Agency focal point for the coordination, liaison, monitoring, and influencing the implementation of design and construction of the building project.

### III. DISCUSSION - OPTIONS AND FACTORS AFFECTING NEW CONSTRUCTION

#### A. Justification

##### 1. Cost Effectiveness

The present dispersed location of Agency functions has had a \_\_\_\_\_ effect upon Agency operational efficiency and cost effectiveness in terms of personnel, money, and facilities. Agency occupancy of such multi-building locations has resulted in loss of personnel time due to travel between facilities and duplication of guards, receptionists, couriers and mail clerks, building services officers, and administrative/supervisory personnel. Large sums of money are being expended on



rents for leased commercial buildings, TWX service, telephone mileage charges, additional telephone switching equipment, reimbursement of private car use and formal vehicle and shuttle bus service. In addition, many space functions have been duplicated such as, supply rooms, receptionist areas, guard locker rooms, snack bars, and classified waste storage and collection vaults. In 1972, Building Planning Staff No. 2 prepared a study which addressed the benefits to be derived in this area through consolidation at Headquarters. The study concluded that worthwhile operational cost savings and personnel savings could be realized in the above areas and that very obvious operational efficiencies would be achieved.

## 2. Headquarters Overcrowding

Through the years of Agency growth and general on-going reorganization, there have been component relocations to external buildings to provide space for components whose presence is required in Headquarters Building. As Headquarters components continue to grow and new organizations are created, they are willing to accept more densely occupied space conditions in Headquarters Building in order to be more contiguous to their parent

component and achieve greater operational efficiency. Accordingly, the Headquarters Building has become overcrowded to the saturation point. Agency Headquarters standard office space occupancy rates are \_\_\_\_\_ square feet per person as compared to federal government standards of 150 square feet per person. These sub-standard levels of space occupancy are unacceptable since they create inadequate working conditions which are a deterrent to operational efficiency, employee morale, and employee health. The relief of such overcrowded conditions in Headquarters Building is one of the several logical and necessary justifications to construct anew facility.

### 3. Environmentally Sensitive Equipment Facilities Problems

In addition to changes in Agency organization and growth, the Agency has undergone a transition in its technological development. Increasing amounts of the building have become technically oriented and contain ESE housed in environmentally sophisticated areas which are supported by special and independent back-up utilities support systems. Continuing saturation of these areas with additional equipment is taxing the capacities of utilities support systems and present physical features

of these areas are drastically limiting further utilities distributions. The ESE study previously referred to in this paper identified marginable support posture for existing ESE areas and an inadequate environment for future equipment. Study recommendations included relocations and replacement of ESE areas within adequately designed state of the art facilities in Headquarters Building. Using components desire relocation to a new facility. The problems to be overcome and the benefits to be derived in the relocation of ESE functions would support justification of new construction or replacement construction within Headquarters Building depending upon the overall advantages to be gained by the Agency.

B. Scope and Cost Options

In order to establish a cost yardstick for general discussion purposes, an assignment of costs for various portions of this proposed building program has been projected and is submitted as Attachment (3.) <sup>CHECK THIS ?</sup> Cost factors used are a measure of current average square foot costs of pure office buildings and special purpose buildings in the construction industry. Total project costs also include projected yearly cost escalation; projected costs for architectural and engineering (A/E) design services, General Services Administration (GSA) services, and contingencies. Total area requirements have been determined on the basis of a ratio of 75 percent net area space to 25 percent gross area space. Cost assignments should be interpreted as general "ballpark estimates" for comparative purposes at this time. More accurate estimates will be available as specific requirements are identified through further study and project development.

25X1A

1. Relieve Headquarters Overcrowding

The average rate of office space occupancy <sup>NOW WILL</sup>  <sup>MOVE</sup>  <sup>IN THE</sup>  <sup>AFFECT ?</sup>

Headquarters Building is  square feet per person and approximately  square feet per person relative to all useable operational space. Such occupancy

25X1A

25X1A

conditions are below comparable Federal occupancy levels of approximately 150 square feet per person for an overall building average. In order to relieve such overcrowded space occupancy conditions and pro-



to be provided for relocated office type functions.

## 2. Relocate Headquarters Building ESE Space

The referenced ESE study identified approximately 65,000 square feet of environmentally sensitive equipment areas in Headquarters Building which should be relocated to more adequate facilities. Functions recommended to be relocated included the OJCS, ISG, OEL, computer centers, the OC signal center Max II, ACT, and Data Communications functions, the telephone frame room, and several smaller sensitive equipment areas. It is anticipated that approximately 80,000 net square feet, including some expansion, would be required to satisfy these requirements in another facility. A new facility of approximately 107,000

gross square feet at a cost of approximately \_\_\_\_\_ would be necessary to adequately house such functions and provide the operational environment and the sophisticated utilities support required.

#### Statement of Pros and Cons

##### Pros

1. Provide adequate physical and technical state of the art environment and reliable utilities support.

2. Provide adequate space and expansion potential.

3. Solve immediate, short, and long range Headquarters Building ESE problems involving a decreasing marginal ability to provide adequate utilities reliability support and safety conditions.

4. Avoid decentralized expansion of overcrowded Headquarters Building ESE areas due to restrictive permanent physical barriers.

5. Eliminate the perpetuation of incremental, decentralized and potentially unreliable Headquarters Building utilities system expansions due to overloaded, overcrowded, and restricted status of existing support systems.

##### Cons

1. Extensive expenditure of sunk costs for existing ESE areas supports retention of these functions in Headquarters Building.

2. Relocation to a new facility would separate ESE functions from parent and using components in Headquarters Building, resulting in inconvenience and a reduction of operational efficiency.

3. A new facility for Headquarters Building relocated ESE functions excludes the solution of remaining special purpose areas and external facilities ESE area requirements.

4. Per the ESE study recommendation, relocation of ESE areas to adequate facilities on the first floor of Headquarters Building would be less expensive than the construction of a new ESE building.

5. The time required for new construction would not allow for the solution of current and immediate future ESE expansion requirements and would result in duplicate Headquarters Building construction and eventual new building construction.

WHAT ABOUT 7-12 YRS CONSTRUCTION TIME? SEE \*5 CON

Pros

HOW  
EQUATE TO #4

Cons

6. Existing Critical and UPS power generating systems could be made to serve a new ESE building.
7. Existing independent special Headquarters air conditioning systems could be made to serve the building winter cooling load of special office functions in place of larger powerhouse air conditioning systems.
8. Recapture of Headquarters Building operational space for more suitable use as general administrative office support space could be achieved.
9. Existing special utilities support systems have reached or are nearing full capacity.
10. Special purpose space in Headquarters Building has always been adapted within an inadequate office space designed environment which is a limiting factor to existing and expansion ESE design and construction.